NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

DEVOTED TO THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL BENEVOLENCE AND MISCELLANY OF CHASTE AND MORAL TENDENCY.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. IV. SATURDAY, JANUARY 10, 1835. NO. 11.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK AND PHILADELPHIA, AND EDITED BY

T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. Price, Publisher and Proprietor.

TERMS—Two dollars per ann. in advance, or $2,50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia. Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

ORIGINAL SERMON.

BY C. F. LE FEVRE.

And the King was much moved and went up to the chamber over the gate and wept; and as he went, thus he said, O my son Absalom! my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!
2 Samuel xviii, 33.

You have all read of Absalom, undutiful, ungrateful, ill fated Absalom! What a lesson of instruction is unfolded! what a moral is taught in all the circumstances connected with the destiny of that unfortunate youth! Nursed in the lap of ease and indulgence, the darling object of his royal parent's favor, he was destined to lacerate the tender bosom that had cherished him—unhappy father of a wretched son! deeply hadst thou already drunk of the cup of affliction, and now thou art called upon to drain the very dregs of its bitterness! How mysterious are the ways of providence! how unsearchable the judgments of heaven! How blind is the transgressor who hopes that trouble will not overtake him or that he will escape the twice ten thousand circumstances which are all conspiring to effect a righteous retribution. Deluded, infatuated wretch! as well might he hope to handle the burning coals and escape unhurt, as to pollute his soul with sin and not be visited with a just reward. How keenly was David made to feel that the path of sin is the road of death. How prophetic of his own sad case was the sentiment which he penned, "He made a pit and digged it, and is fallen into the ditch which he made. His mischief shall return upon his own head and his violent dealing shall come down upon his own pate." But a few short years previously, David had tarnished the glory of his name—sullied the brightness of his reputation, and dishonored himself in the sight of Israel by an act unparalleled for cruelty and treachery. I refer to the case of Uriah, the Hittite. Inflamed with lawless passion for the wife of the Hittite, he devises a scheme, in which cruelty is only surpassed by treachery. Knowing the bravery of this valuable officer—his courageous and generous disposition, he sends him to one of his captains, who was then engaged in a border warfare, giving him a letter to the commander. The unsuspicious and valiant servant of his royal master, delivers the letter, which was his death-warrant. No doubt he expected that it was a letter of commendation, for David had distinguished him with marks of attention and respect, but alas! it was written in blood and penned for destruction.—Here it is, "Set ye, Uriah the Hittite in the forefront of the hottest battle, and retire ye from him, that he may be smitten and die." What cold, calculating, merciless cruelty was here! The seducer of the wife, becomes the murderer of the husband—the guilty paramour becomes the dastardly assassin.

But short is the triumph of guilt! The misery which David thus brought on others, was to return on his own devoted head. In his own family—in the very heart of his affections the angel of retribution was to plant the poisoned dart, and the hand that was chosen to inflict the wound, was that of his favored, cherished child. He was to be the imitator of his father's treachery, and cause his declining sun to set behind a dark and cloudy horizon. He commences his career of wickedness by an act of treason against the sovereign power of his father. He avails himself of the popularity which he had acquired by fawning, to alienate the affections of his father's subjects, and by misrepresenting the character of his parent, and holding up his own as a pattern of equity and justice—"he steals the hearts of the men of Israel," and wins them to his cause. Having thus by subtlety acquired power to carry his nefarious schemes into effect, he throws off the mask and becomes the open and avowed enemy of his father, and seeks to drive him from the throne. Treason had now done her uttermost, and the venerable parent flees from Jerusalem, that he may not fall a victim to the projects of his own son. What a change was here! David, who but a short time since, was at the acme of his glory, before whom a united people bowed in humble obeisance, is now driven from the throne of his fathers and seeks an asylum in the wilderness from the paricidal arm of his own son. "And David went up by the ascent of Mount Olives, and wept as he went up, and had his head covered, and he went bare-foot, and all the people that was with him, covered every man his head, and they went up weeping as they went up."

It is unnecessary to pursue the reckless course of the wayward Absalom through all the changes and chances of war, till we reach the catastrophe of his ill-spent life. His career was short. Disaffection took place among those who had sworn fidelity to his cause—distraction followed in all their councils—the principal mover of sedition in whom the most reliance had been placed met with a shameful and inglorious death, and the remnant of Absalom's friends were divided and scattered. At this critical period the contending armies meet, and great was the slaughter of Absalom's deluded followers. Victory followed the royal standard—confusion and defeat the rebels. The scene of action was laid in the mazes of a forest, and the king's son in his attempt to escape, was caught by the hair in the branches of an oak tree, and while thus pendent between heaven and earth, a captain of David's band, regardless of the king's strict injunctions, "to do the youth no harm—to deal gently with Absalom for the father's sake"—transfixed him with a dart. Thus, in the flower of youth, in all the beauty of adolescence, perished the unhappy Absalom—a fearful monument of unrestrained ambition and filial disobedience. The news of the sad fate of his undutiful child is brought to the father. The messengers approach the royal presence and the first inquiry is that which lay nearest the monarch's heart. "Is the the young man Absalom safe?" O how strong is parental affection! How indissoluble that tie which binds the parent to the child! Not the disobedience of Absalom—not the shout of victory over his enemies, could efface from the heart of David those traces which had been engraven by the hand of nature. Sad to the heart of the father was the intelligence communicated of the untimely fate of his son. In one moment his wrongs are buried—all a father's love pervades his heart and in the true eloquence of grief he exclaims, "O Absalom my son, my son, would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" How touching is the language and what a testimony does it bear to the truth that nothing can destroy a parent's fond affection for his offspring.

The history which has engaged our attention is replete with instruction and a lesson may be derived from every circumstance connected therewith. Let us make it profitable for correction and our growth in righteousness by "pointing a moral" and bringing its application home to ourselves.—The first remark is one at which we have already glanced—the *inevitable* misery which sin produces. O could this truth be stamped upon the mind, what a load of trouble and mischief would be removed from the world! Unbelieving man will not receive the truth, till experience, whose voice *will* be heard, tells him that he is in the way of death. In the season of youth and inexperience the tempter whispers in his ear that there is *pleasure* in sin and tho' caution may suggest that beneath the rose the thorn is found, yet "hope tells the flattering tale" that *he* at least may escape its point. He listens to the Syren voice, embarks his happiness in the frail bark of illicit pleasure and soon is wrecked on the shoals of disappointment and sorrow. Why then will men teach that there is pleasure in sin? Why tempt the untutored child of nature to believe that there is any possible joy connected with disobedience? If you gild the bait he will surely devour the treacherous morsel—in vain shall wisdom teach that the enticing bait conceals the barbed hook—he will try for himself and find the painful reality. But much more fatal and extensive will be the delusion, if you proceed to tell him that there is a probable chance of his escaping all the inconveniences of sin, while its pleasures are exceedingly delectable. Preach to him that a *certain* inconvenience does not attend crime—that the evil consequences are very *remote*, and that by a timely process even they may be averted--- and the mischief will be consummated--every strand that enforces moral obedience from a consideration of its happy tendency will be severed, and the victim of false teaching will be left to slumber in security 'till roused from his lethargy by the voice of ruin, ringing its sad peals in his ears.

Another remark on this subject existing opinions compel us to make, and that is, that no possible situation or combination of circumstances can save the transgressor from the merited con-

sequences of his deserts. There is no error into which the world has run more popular than this. If *outwardly* all appears fair, then is the foolish and inconsiderate conclusion deduced, that all is peace within. The *prosperous* sinner by common consent is esteemed happy. If "a man's eyes stick out with fatness" and he has more than heart can wish, then the unreflecting multitude pronounce him a happy man. Oh! little can the vacant, gazing, uncalculating world know of what is passing within; to them it is not given to unfold the volume of future events and read the sure consequences which will flow from sinful indulgences. "All that glitters is not gold." Many a pang may lacerate the bosom—many a cutting reflection may harrow up the mind—many a cankering care may corrode the soul, even when the forced smile of joy illumines the face. The monarch on his throne, surrounded with all the glittering pageantry of state cannot shut out the judicial sentence of that monitor who has erected his tribunal in every heart. Let then no one presumptuously say that punishment and crime are not duly apportioned in the present life. That is beyond his ken—he cannot read the heart of another—he knows nothing of its joys and sorrows—he cannot even tell how it is affected by *outward* circumstances. A superficial observer—one unacquainted with all intermediate circumstances might have supposed David a happy man—he was outwardly prosperous; but alas! the peace of the inner man was wrecked, and royalty and grandeur and the pomp and glory of this world could afford no balm to that stricken spirit. Let not then one mortal presume to fix the standard, by which he shall measure his fellow man. The measure and quantum can only be adjusted by him in whose hands are the hearts of the children of men. In the beautiful language of the Scottish bard

> "Who made the heart, 'tis *He* alone
> Decidedly can try us.
> He knows each chord—its various tone—
> Each spring, its varied bias."

Of one thing, however, we are well assured, that no one can violate the known dictates of his own conscience and enjoy himself as well as if he followed them—and if we judge a righteous judgment we should not hesitate to say, that any one who yields conscience for any other consideration makes but a sorry bargain. "Man wants but little here below, nor wants that little long," and if he can enjoy that with a conscience void of offence and a mind without guile, he may be pronounced a happy man. Raise him to a throne—let a nation worship at his feet—clothe him in robes resplendent with the diamond's bright lustre—let him quaff the purple juice from golden goblets—let his bed be down, and the sweetest strains of music fall in rich cadence on his ravished senses—but sting him with remorse, pollute him with crime and how great a loser will he be by the exchange! The meanest peasant whose daily toil scarcely supplies the loud demands of appetite, enjoys a heaven compared to that *royal wretch*. Oh who can administer to a mind diseased? who can lull that bosom to repose which is tumultuously agitated by the tempest of the soul? Let us not then be told that it needs the retribution of another world to rectify the inequalities of the present life. It must first be proved that this is a state of unequal retribution and that never can be done until man shall be able to read the thoughts and penetrate the recesses of his brother's heart.—When you can assume immateriality and enter into those secret chambers unlock all the thoughts and bring to light all its emotions, and detect all its secrets workings and movements, then you will be competent to say how much of the debt is left unpaid; but until this is done, your speculations and unfounded assertions are but "an idle tale." You tell us God will exercise a righteous retribution by and by. Are we to infer that He does not do it *now*? Does he wait for any particular and set period to be righteous and just in his dealings! Is he not a God that "judgeth in the earth" and "all his ways are righteousness and judgment." Why then push retributive justice out of this world and shut out that process of administration which would most benefit the subjects thereof? I can see no reason for such a wild and irrational procedure.

Another lesson and by far the most pleasing is taught us, in the tender pity of David for his offending child. How pathetic was his exclamation! how soon did the spirit of forgiveness wash from his memory the wrongs which he had suffered. His son was now a cold corpse before him and in the tomb to which he was consigned did the waves of oblivion wash out all his frailties and errors. Among all nations, even the most savage and barbarous, the grave shuts out all enmity and buries all rancor. David had *now* no other feelings towards his child—his deluded Absalom, than those of pity and forgiveness. Shall the Christian, under a better covenant, founded on better promises—a more enlarged view of moral excellency, carry his enmity beyond the present state and rake up resentment from the ashes of the dead? And if this is forbidden to the Christian, how shall we dare attribute such conduct to the Christian's God? Is HE alone in all the universe to stand pre-eminent in revenge? is his wrath never to be assuaged? is his anger eternal? Are the creatures whom he has made, to surpass in moral excellence the God who has created them? Let us not blaspheme the name of the most high by such a supposition, but receive his own infallibile testimony—"that he does not willingly grieve or afflict the children of men," that as a father correcteth his children so the Lord chasteneth us, that we may be partakers of his holiness.—Hear how he appeals to the best feelings of his children; "be pitiful, be courteous, forgiving one another, loving one another, as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."

I claim your indulgence by introducing in conclusion an eloquent and poetic sketch of David mourning over Absalom. I am sensible that I am departing from the common routine observed in pulpit orations. But I trust the beauty of the piece will be a sufficient apology. It is the production of a highly gifted pen and one of Columbia's favorite Bards.

> The waters slept. Night's silvery vale hung low
> On Jordan's bosom, and the eddies curled
> Their glassy rings beneath it, like the still
> Unbroken beating of the sleeper's pulse.
> The reeds bent down the stream—the willow leaves
> With a soft cheek upon the lulling tide,
> Forgot the lifting winds, and the long stems
> Whose flowers the waters like a gentle nurse
> Bears on its bosom, quietly gave way
> And leaned in graceful attitudes to rest.
> How strikingly the course of nature tells,
> By its light heed of human suffering,
> That it was fashioned for a happier world!
>
> King David's limbs were weary. He had fled
> From far Jerusalem, and now he stood
> With his faint people for a little rest
> Upon the shore of Jordan. The light wind
> Of morn was stirring, and he bared his brow
> To its refreshing breath, for he had worn
> The mourner's covering, and had not felt
> That he could see his people until now.
> They gathered round him on the fresh green bank
> And spoke their kindly words, and as the sun
> Rose up in Heaven, he knelt among them there,
> And bowed his head upon his hands to pray.
> Oh when the heart is full—when bitter thoughts
> Come crowding thickly up for utterance,
> And the poor common words of courtesy
> Are such a very mockery—how much
> The bursting heart may pour itself in prayer!
> He prayed for Israel; and his voice went up
> Strongly and fervently—he prayed for those
> Whose love had been his shield; and his deep tones
> Grew tremulous—but oh for Absalom—
> For his estranged, misguided Absalom—
> The proud, bright being who had burst away
> In all his princely beauty to defy
> The heart that cherished him—for him he poured,
> In agony that would not be controll'd,
> Strong supplication, and forgave him there
> Before his God, for his deep sinfulness.
>
> * * * * * * * *
>
> The pall was settled. He who slept beneath
> Was straiten'd for the grave; and as the folds
> Sunk to the still proportions, they betrayed
> The matchless symmetry of Absalom.
> His hair was yet unshorn, and the silken curls
> Were floating round the tassels as they sway'd
> To the admitted air, as glossy now
> As when in hours of gentle dalliance bathing
> The snowy fingers of Judea's girls.
> His helm was at his feet—his banner, soiled
> With trailing through Jerusalem, was laid
> Revers'd beside him—and the jewell'd hilt
> Whose diamonds lit the passage of his blade,
> Rested like mockery on his cover'd brow.
> The soldiers of the King trod to and fro,
> Clad in the garb of battle, and their Chief
> The mighty Joab, stood beside his bier
> And gazed upon the dark pall steadfastly
> As if he feared the slumberer might stir.
> A slow step startled him. He grasped his blade
> As if a trumpet rang; but the bent form
> Of David entered, and he gave command
> In a low tone to his few followers,
> And left him with the dead. The King stood still
> Till the last echo died; then throwing off
> The sackcloth from his brow, and laying back
> The pall from the still features of his child,
> He bowed his head upon him, and broke forth
> In the resistless eloquence of wo.
>
> "Alas, my noble boy—that thou should'st die!
> Thou, who wert made so beautifully fair—
> That death should settle in thy glorious eye,
> And leave his stillness in this clustering hair!
> How could he mark thee for the silent tomb,
> My proud boy Absalom?
>
> "Cold is thy brow, my son!—and I am chill
> As to my bosom I have tried to press thee—
> How was I wont to feel my pulses thrill,
> Like a rich harp-string, yearning to caress thee!
> And hear thy sweet "*my Father*" from these dumb
> And cold lips, Absalom!
>
> "The grave hath won thee—I shall hear the gush
> Of music, and the voices of the young—
> And life will pass me in the mantling blush
> And the dark tresses to the soft wings flung—
> But thou no more with thy sweet voice shall come
> To meet me, Absalom!—
>
> "And oh when I am stricken—and my heart
> Like a bruised reed is waiting to be broken—
> How will its love for thee, as I depart,
> Yearn for thine ear to drink its last deep token!
> It were so sweet amid Death's gathering gloom
> To see thee, Absalom!
>
> "And now farewell! 'tis hard to give thee up,
> With death so like a gentle slumber on thee.—
> And thy dark sin!—Oh I could drink the cup
> If from this wo its bitterness had won thee—
> May God have called thee like a wanderer home,
> My erring Absalom!—"
>
> He covered up his face and bowed himself
> A moment on his child—then giving him
> A look of melting tenderness, he clasp'd
> His hands convulsively as if in prayer,
> And as a strength were given him of God,
> He rose up calmly; and compos'd the pall
> Firmly and decently, and left him there
> As if his rest had been a breathing sleep.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

[From the Philadelphian of Jan. 1, 1835]

To Mr. Abel C. Thomas.—Letter 12.

Philadelphia, Dec. 31st, 1834.

Dear Sir—The account which our Savior gives, Luke xvi, 19—31, of the rich man and Lazarus, is designed to be the subject of the present letter. This *account* is not called a *parable*. I regard it as being Christ's statement of some events of which he had perfect knowledge. But had the narration been introduced by the preface, *Jesus spake unto them this parable*, I should say, that a parable is but an extended similitude, or illustration, designed not to introduce fancies, but to exhibit and enforce truth.

"There was," really, "a certain rich man," whom Jesus knew, "which was clothed in purple and fine linen and fared sumptuously every day." His riches are not represented as having been a crime or any thing undesirable. He is not censured for his elegant and neat attire: nor was it any offence to God that he partook plentifully of the bounties of Divine Providence.—

Some have imagined a thousand evil things against this rich man, but in my judgment Christ drew the most amiable and inoffensive character of a mere worlding that the reality of the case would allow. He intended to present the most favorable circumstances in which an ungodly man could be placed, and contrast them with the most abject poverty of a true christian.

"And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores." Probably Lazarus had in his own past experience found that it was well for him to seek charitable assistance at this rich man's door, and therefore desired again to be laid there. There is no proof that the rich man was hard hearted, and refused him the pittance which would relieve his wants. Even the dogs of this establishment were friendly to the beggar, who must have been countenanced by the family, or instead of licking his sores, they would probably have torn him to pieces.

Mark the contrast between these two individuals in this life: one was rich, the other poor; one was well, the other sick; one was clothed in purple and fine linen, and the other in the rags of a beggar; one fared sumptuously, and the other presumed to ask for nothing but the crumbs; one was sound in body and lovely in his appearance, while the other was loathsome from his sores.

Now follow these same individuals out of this present world. "And it came to pass that the beggar died." "The rich man also died, and was buried," probably with pomp and solemnity; but whether the beggar was buried or not, has been left untold. His body was probably carried without ceremony, to some place of deposit. Each of these individuals was removed from the face of the earth.

But what became of their souls? For "there is a spirit in man;" and when "the golden bowl is broken, or the pitcher is broken at the fountain"—"then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." The Savior proceeds to inform us what became of their spirits or souls; of that part in these human beings which we call *themselves*. They both had a conscious existence immediately after death. That in them which thought, remembered, reasoned, desired and felt either pleasure or pain, had a continuous duration; but leaving their bodies, they found themselves in widely different circumstances in the world of departed spirits. Both were in the state of the dead; both knew whence they had come, and whom they had left behind them on earth. One of them was in a state of misery in which he was surprised to find himself; in which he experienced fruitless desire, disappointment and despair. "The beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom;" into a holy happy society, in which he enjoyed the friendship, confidence, and love of Abraham, the father of the faithful: for *Abraham's bosom* is but an emblem of all these social benefits.

"The rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell," in the state of the dead, or world of departed spirits, "he lifted up his eyes," just as a man in his dreams may be said to do, thereby denoting his surprize, "being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." They were both so situated in the state of departed spirits, that they could recognize each other still, as well as they once did on earth: and the rich man knew that Lazarus was a companion of his patriarchal ancestor Abraham. In this state the rich man, surprised to find himself lost, had not ceased to experience natural affection for himself and his kindred.—He desired deliverance from his misery, and as some religionists do on earth, instead of immediately calling on God, he began to pray to one of the saints. "And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tips of his finger in water, and cool my tongue: for I am tormented in this flame."

It was necessary for the Savior, if he described the torments of the lost spirit at all, so that men could understand him, to use similitudes. He symbolizes, therefore, the torments of the damned, by comparing them to pains produced by intense and unquenchable fires. He presents the rich man as desiring the least relief of which we can conceive under the parching thirst which he experienced. He asked but the cooling of his tongue by means of the moistened finger of one of his former acquaintances. To show that the lost sinner is without any prospect of relief, the Saviour proceeds in his narration to say, "But Abraham said, son, remember that thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted and thou art tormented." Here Christ presents a contrast between the rich man *in this life*, and *after this life*. He tells us how different were the portions allotted to these persons after they were dead, from the portions which they experienced while they were alive on earth. In his life-time on earth the rich man had good, and Lazarus evil things: but now, beyond the present life, Lazarus was *comforted* and the rich man was *tormented*.

To show that none who die unprepared to pass to the society of Abraham, can after death exchange their miserable for an improved state, it is added, "beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from us to you cannot: neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.', Here the purpose of God that the future condition of the righteous and the wicked, of those who go to Abraham's bosom and of those who awake in torments is denoted by an impassable gulf situated between two places. As men on one location would for ever be separated from men on an opposite location by an impassable, bottomless abyss, so they who pass from earth to the torments of the world of spirits are forever separated from the state and happiness of the blessed. I know not how the Savior could have taught the future, endless punishment of some, who will die without true piety, in clearer, plainer, stronger terms.

To represent the lost in a state of future misery as being still possessed of human nature, memory and sympathy, whose natural affections, lawful as they are, and even commendable, will still afford no relief to their misery, we have a further dialogue between Abraham and the rich man.

"Then he said, I pray thee, therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment." Here we learn that there is a *place of torment* for some human beings after they have died. This *place of punishment*, and the state of endless misery, we call *hell*; using the word to denote not merely "the hell," or state of the dead to which Christ's spirit departed, when he expired on the cross, but that *Hell* or *Tophet*, or *Tartarus*, or prison of despair for which Christ selected the names of the valley of Gehinnom, *Gehenna*, and *hell fire* as suitable emblems.

"And Abraham said unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them."

Deceiving himself, as sinners on earth have always done, the lost rich man replied, "Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead they will repent."

And Abraham said unto him, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

In this representation of the world of saved and of lost spirits there is nothing unreasonable; and in our interpretation of it nothing strained. We think every candid reader would naturally come to the same conclusions that all orthodox Christians have ever done.

To make the passage appear to teach any other doctrine has ever required all the ingenuity of the Universalists, and will doubtless engage one of the most active and bold of their society in the present day. I refer to my correspondent, whose talents I respect, and who in perverting scripture by scripture seems to me to have no superior on earth.

EZRA STILES ELY.

(For A. C. T.'s Reply see 6th page.)

SOCIETY MEETING.

A meeting of the Second Universalist Society was notified last Sabbath to be held in the Lecture Room of the Orchard st. Church on MONDAY EVENING next, 12th inst. at 6 o'clock. We really hope there may be a numerous attendance. Let every one who attends that church, our young men, as well as old, and who feel an interest in its prosperity, make their arrangements so as to be present without fail. It will occupy but little time, and a full meeting will cheer the hearts of all.

Adjourned Meeting.

The general meeting held at the Greenwich church last Monday Evening, stands adjourned to next TUESDAY EVENING, (13th inst.) to meet at the same place, at 6 o'clock. A full attendance is especially desired.

CONCERT OF SACRED MUSIC.

The regular monthly Concert of the *Mozart Sacred Music Society* will take place at the Orchard-st. Church on TUESDAY EVENING next, 13th inst. Performances to commence at half past 7 o'clock. Tickets, 25 cents each, may be had at this office, or at the door. We are desired by the Society to say that Tickets procured for the Benefit Concert, (in behalf of the Dorcas Society,) will be received on Tuesday evening, several having been sold which have not yet been returned in.

CONCERT OF SACRED MUSIC,

Wednesday Evening Jan. 14.

In the Callowhill-st. Universalist Church.

The friends of Universalism in Philadelphia and the adjacent Districts, are informed that the avails are to be devoted to the liquidation of the balance of debt contracted in repairing and otherwise improving the Callowhill st. Church. I have no hesitation in guaranteeing a rich treat of "sweet sounds" to those who may attend. Tickets, price 25 cents, may be obtained of the sexton of the church, or at the door on the evening of the Concert. Let our friends keep in view the ultimate object of the measure, and then act *as Universalists*. I suppose I am understood, and therefore will add nothing more A. C. T.

*** The poetical favor from Mrs. Downer, two articles from Br. Fuller, and the first of a series from Brs. Moore and Hallock are all gratefully acknowledged. Mrs. D.'s and one of Br. Fuller's should have appeared this week, but a glance at the crowded state of our columns, we hope will fully excuse us. They will appear next week, as also an interesting notice of the Christmas services at Danbury, Conn.

Married,

In New-York city on the evening of the 4th inst. by the Rev. T. J. Sawyer Mr. LEVI RAMSDELL and Miss LUCRETIA PRATT.

In New-York, on Wednesday evening, 7th inst. by Rev. T. J Sawyer Mr. OSMAR S. WATKINS, and Miss EVELINA KREWZON.

In Philadelphia, on the evening of the 1st inst. by Rev. S. W. Fuller, Mr. ANDREW SHALLADAY and Miss MARY GRICE, all of the Northern Liberties.

In Williamsburgh N. Y. on the evening of the 4th inst. by the Rev. T. J. Sawyer, Mr. JOHN U. NOYES, of Providence R. I. and Miss FRANCES S. UPDIKE, of New-York.

Died,

In New York, suddenly, on the morning of the 1st inst. EMILY infant daughter of Mr. L. Pratt, aged 6 months.

Religious Notices are crowded out.

Original.

THE LADY PREACHER.

Several years have now elapsed since I left the city, driven with many others by the yellow fever to seek a more retired and healthy situation; but the beautiful sequestered village of Plainville, with its white meeting house, its neat dwellings, its quiet inhabitants, and particularly its amiable Lady Preacher, is distinctly remembered.

The village, as you look down from the hills, appears to be situated in a valley, delightfully quiet, and as it were, shut out from the cares and follies of the world. The manners of the inhabitants are plain, and their wants, which are few, are amply supplied by the fertility of the soil and their industrious habits. Fields of yellow harvest, orchards loaded with fruit, and ample meadows, with hills which might almost be called mountains, partly covered with forests, and which seem to encircle the valley, make up the scene. A large creek passes through the whole length of the valley, and receives numberless smaller streams, which descend from the hills and give fertility to this beautiful and retired glen.

I had been but a few days in the place when I was invited to attend the funeral of one of its inhabitants. An occurrence of this kind in the country produces a far different effect from a funeral in the city. In a populous town the parade of woe passes and is soon forgotton, but in the country a general solemnity pervades for some days the whole neighborhood. On inquiry, I learned that the deceased was a young man, the hope of his aged parents. He was spoken of as being kind in his deportment, and "able to mow by the side of any man of his age." Prompted by a desire to observe the manners of the inhabitants, I strolled leisurely into the grave yard, just as the funeral procession came over the hill and turned into the gate. The inclosure for the dead was near the neat plain meeting house.—A natural grove of oaks occupied that part of it which had not yet been disturbed by the spade; and on the opposite side was a row of willows, under the shade of which were the green graves of the villagers, side by side.

The coffin was taken from a wagon, and set down beside the place for its interment, and around which the neighbors collected. After a pause of some moments, during which the silence was only interrupted by the sobs of the relatives of the deceased, a woman, a little passed the middle age, stepped forth, and began to address the assemblage. She wore the garb of a Quakeress, and I must confess that I was predisposed to find fault. I was firmly pursuaded that an over heated zeal, or some womanly vanity had prompted her thus to exhibit herself. But my preconceived notions rapidly gave way to better impressions. Her beautiful countenance indicated much amiableness of character and cheerful devotion. Her style was simple, without any attempt at effect, or any over strained zeal; and, if it lacked the finish of the college, it was also free from its formality. There was no hesitancy in her manner, neither did there appear to be any undue boldness. Her voice was mellow, and the pure religion and holy confidence, which seemed to come warm from the best of hearts, soon drew abundance of tears from the eyes of the listeners; and if I did not myself drop a tear, it was because the feelings of surprize and admiration mingled too strongly with the tender emotions which the scene and occasion produced.

I will not presume to write her sermon, if sermon it might be called, for if it were possible to give it in her own beautiful language, it would lose its principal effect, which was communicated by her manner. I scarcely know when I have been so much affected, or when the follies and passions which agitate the great world have appeared so utterly vain and frivolous; or when I have been so deeply in love with that pure religion which is as much removed from the fashionable piety, as it is from scepticism or bigotry. Either there was something in her manner, or in her sentiments, or the quiet of the assembly and the scene, or the solemnity of the occasion; or in all together, which produced a degree of reverence and devotion, which I have rarely felt and cannot easily describe.

She spoke of the grave, and its attendant griefs, with great solemnity, hinted at the lesson of humility it ought to teach, the distinctions and animosities which here must be laid aside—the proud, the humble, the meek and the confident must moulder into undistinguished dust. But she soon passed from this gloomy part of her subject to the consoling hope of a happy immortality. This part of her speech she introduced with this beautiful passage of Scripture:—"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Her language and her countenance seemed to partake of the subject, and her heart appeared to glow with holy trust, as she told of that good Creator, who "would not forsake those who put their trust and confidence in him; but who would bestow upon them, in this life, that peace which the world with all its glitter could not give, nor its frowns take away; and would finally gather them into his banqueting house, where his banner over them would be love."

I could not but ask myself mentally, where had this woman learned her beautiful religion? for she has not the formality of society about her, nor that dignity, if I may so call it, that ladies distinguished in the church, generally possess. Her manners, like her sermon, was *nature*.—Surely, said, I, that good Being whose sun has shined on her native hills, and poured his beams on the meadows before her door, through which winds the "honey-meadow brook," has poured the perfection of his love into her gentle heart; where no anti-christ of authority existed to fright it away, and supplant its place; and in this good ground, it had brought forth an hundred fold.

When she had finished speaking, the coffin was lowered into the grave, some grass was sprinkled over it to prevent the clods from rattling too loudly on its lid, and the grave was filled by the silent and sorrowful neighbors.

I have since learned that this good woman has paid the debt of nature, and is buried in the same grave yard. Many years must pass away, and I must mingle much with the world before she will be forgotton by JACOB.

Original.

To Believers in Endless Misery—No. 3.

Friends—You have been told that Universalism is a licentious doctrine, that it is a snare of the enemy, a fatal delusion, calculated to deceive the unwary, and lure the thoughtless to destruction. Too many of you have received these *false* accusations against the truth of God.—Were our doctrine of this stamp you would be justified in your enmity against it; for you ought to hate evil. But you are deceived—the restitution of all things is a doctrine of the Bible; and these charges against it are false and slanderous.

Think—the whole history of mankind gives a loud, distinct and decided sound *against* your conclusions. The tremendous doctrine of endless woe has long been preached, long believed, and sometimes almost universally dreaded; yet vice still stalks abroad at noon day, and preys upon the vitals of human virtue in midnight revelries! The sad picture of society during the dark ages of the Christian church, furnishes but a melancholy comment upon the moral tendency of the doctrine of endless punishment. Why did not that doctrine yield those salutary fruits then, of which your teachers say so much? Tell me why it is, that the oppressive, intolerant, persecuting and proscribing of all ages, have been believers in that doctrine? How is this fact reconcileable with the professed utility of that sentiment? Yet the supposed licentious tendency of Universalism is one of the objections most frequently urged against it. Is it not your duty to investigate this sentiment, and see if it does not contain principles better adapted to the wants of mankind, more peaceful in their tendency, more humane in their operations? May you not expect to find that doctrine in the Bible, which of all sentiments, is the most salutary in its restraints—the most efficient in its power to reform and regulate the feelings of humanity?

There, you will find that the wicked *shall not* go unpunished—that the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner—that "as in Adam all die, even so, in Christ shall all be made alive." Will you think of these things, lest, haply, you be found fighting against God? S. W. F.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Original.

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. Matt. v, 48.

In these words, we are instructed to make the Divine Being the standard of human perfection—the criterion by which to govern our actions. If God is a *perfect* Being, which the text declares Him to be, then it would be well for man to imitate Him so far as possible. It would be *folly*—nay, even *sin*, for man to attempt to *excel* the Supreme Being in perfection—for "it is enough that the disciple should be *as* his Master, and the servant *as* his lord."

With these considerations in view it may be proper to for us to inquire, What is the *character* of God—the nature of that Divine perfection we are exhorted to imitate! In another part of the chapter from which this text is selected, we are instructed to "love our enemies, bless them that curse us, do good to them that hate us," &c. If we act in conformity to these instructions, making God the standard of perfection, then it follows that the Partialist representation of His character is utterly *false*. They will tell us that God *hates* his enemies, and will continue to hate them forever. Although the Saviour has taught us not to be revengeful, but when a brother smites us on one cheek, to turn to him the other also; they will tell us, in effect, that God is more, *infinitely* MORE revengeful than human nature is capable of being! If this be in reality the character of God, what, I would ask, would be the *consequence* if men were to obey the injunction of the Saviour, and imitate Him?—Would they love their enemies—would they do good to them that hate them? So far is it from this, that all their mental skill would be exercised in devising means to inflict the greatest possible *evil* upon them. Mercy would be entirely extinct, and all the horrid practices of the unrestrained Savage would be adopted! Well is it for the cause of humanity, that those who view Deity in the above described character, are not guided by the injunction of the text. O how forbidding—how revolting, must be that theory, which, if brought to practice, would result in such consequences! Partialist reader, we wish not to shock your feelings; but we earnestly, anxiously entreat you to view with candour the condition in which you stand.

But such is *not* the character of God. He loves his *enemies* as well as his *friends*. "He maketh His sun to rise on the *evil* and on the *good*, and sendeth rain on the *just* and on the *unjust*. God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet *sinners*, Christ died for us." (Rom. v, 8.) With these views of the nature of God's perfections impressed upon our minds, we would conclude by enforcing the injunction of the text, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect."

Easton, Pa. W. F.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 10, 1835.

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

At the Orchard-st. Church. Subject for next Sabbath (to morrow) evening, Psalms ix, 17. "*The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.*"

LECTURE AT THE GREENWICH CHURCH.

Subject for Sunday (to morrow) evening, Ezekiel xxxvii, 3. "*And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord, thou knowest.*"

LETTER FROM REV. J. REYNOLDS.

To "A. C. T." and "P."

Gentlemen—The paper containing your references to me, has just been put into my hands by a friend, and I presume you will allow me a little space in your columns for a reply.

I very well remember the interview I had with "A. C. T." in Philadelphia, and the note which I sent him from this place; and though I do not recollect *all* that passed during our interview, I have not forgotten *one* thing which has not been adverted to in the reference, and I will mention it here. Did I not request you, Mr. "A. C. T." and did you not promise, that our conversation should be confidential, and that you would on no account, publish it in any of the prints of the day. Have you kept your word?

As to my wishing to be engaged to preach Universalism, I have not the *least* recollection of it, though I remember of inquiring very particularly where I might hope for success in soliciting subscribers for the "Independent Messenger," a Restorationist paper, printed in Boston. On this subject I gained no information more than that *that* paper was very unpopular with the Universalists. Mr. "A. C. T." informed me that *his* people would not hear the doctrine it advocated, preached; that Mr. Abner Kneeland had confirmed *their* faith; and gave me to understand that Restorationism was quite out of date in that city and region.

As to my religious opinions at that time, they were what they are still. In respect to that *punishment*, in particular, which God inflicts, I am of the opinion that it is *disciplinary*, and of course, cannot be *endless*. I however hold that sin will be followed by endless *consequences*, and that an eternal *loss* of a proportionate degree of *happiness*, will follow *every sin* that is committed. Or in other words, every sinner will be the *worse* to *all eternity* for every sin he commits. Yet I hold as firmly as I hold any truth whatever, that no man will, on the whole, be a loser by his existence, or have any occasion, all things considered, to wish he had never been created. This I used to think was *Restorationism*, though I always knew it was not *Universalism*. But since I have become more acquainted with believers in the former sentiment, I have learned that I am not in this respect a Restorationist;—that I only "see men as trees walking." The Restorationists, as a body, hold that all the effects of sin are limited, and that, in the end, all will be as happy as if they had never been sinners. But I hold that when a man sins he does violence not only to the law of God, but to the law of his nature, and that though the *former* may be propitiated, the latter will resent the outrage forever.

As to the propriety of holding such opinions and remaining in the ministry of the Methodist Protestant Church, it is no where required in the Articles of Religion that I should hold to any particular kind of future punishment, either endless or limited; but the elementary principles of her constitution declare that every man has an inalienable right to private judgement in matters of religion, and an equal right to express his opinions in all proper ways. I did not then use any "dissimulation," always declaring that the consequences of sin would be endless, and having never been required by any of her authorities to explain my meaning further than this. But I did not continue in that church over six weeks after my letter to "A.C.T." but resigned and took a letter of my good standing. But I know many preachers in that and other denominations, who are restorationists in full, but who still hold the doctrine—*sub silentio*.

As to the intimations of "P." I have only to say, that I called at his office a few times, not on a *selfish* errand, but on one for *his* benefit, or, rather, that of his *denomination*. I used freedom in conversing with him, but never called to ask *favors* or *deceive* him in any way; and I know that gentleman will yet do me the justice to soften down some of his unfriendly insinuations.—Should he publish my part of the discussion, I am sure his feelings towards me will change from what they were when he penned his notice of me. But I do not *ask* him to publish any thing of mine. Mr. Williamson requested me to write out my replies, and I shall do so for *his* use; but I am willing Mr. "P." should reprint them or *not*, just as he pleases. I ask no favors on that score. But if he *does* reprint them, *be it known to him and all the world, that my objections are not* SUPPOSED, *but* REAL *ones*, and let him refute them if he can. I hope he will attempt it, and more earnestly do I hope he may prevail.

My motive in meeting Mr. W. in the discussion was to be converted *fully* to his faith, if he could prove it from the Scripture; or to convert him to mine, if he could not. I was much pleased with him, and hope he will permit me to consider him as one of my friends. I make the same remark in relation to each of the Rev. gentlemen to whom he introduced me on that occasion. And since I am engaged with individuals I will say that I was much pleased with "A. C. T." both at the interview in Philadelphia, and at one which we had afterwards in the Trumpet office at Boston. Let the same apply to "P." and Mr. Andrews; and then permit me to say, that I never learned to flatter, but am as fond of fair dealing and upright conduct as either "P." or "A. C. T." and I submit it to the reader, whether a private explanation at first, and then publish if necessary, would not have comported quite as well with the rules of confidential intercourse, on the one hand, and very strong pretensions to brotherly love on the other.

In concluding this communication, permit me to suggest to all concerned the propriety of waiting till the discussion is read, before I am sent to hell on a charge of inconsistency. If I have not treated the Universalists with all respect, why am I damned by one party for that crime? and if I have, why am I put in the inquisition as if I had not, by the other? I am between two fires, and expect to die for treating the Universalists as *I* think they deserve, but not well enough in *their* opinion, and too well in the opinion of *others*. Very well; I am now ready for the ball. Those who hold to no future punishment mean that I shall have enough in this life, if they can heap it on me, and those who hold *to* future punishment mean that I shall have a good *earnest* of it here. But none of these things move me. That I may have committed such things as inconsistencies is very likely, but I have a conscience void of offence in respect to my general course in the ministry. I am, however, prepared for the result of an Argus-eyed examination of my actions, and for comments upon them by no friendly pens. I only regret that so small an object should receive so much notice.

Reader be patient; I will relieve you soon. I offer this to the Editors of the Mess. as an an explanation of the mystery, and I think in justice they are bound to print it entire, and immediately. But they can do as they please; I shall not complain. This is all the notice I shall take of what has appeared, or of what may appear hereafter from them or others. I leave whatever relates to my course to the decision and candor of my fellow men, fearing nothing from any question in which they will not render me justice. The abstract question of Universalism shall never slumber while I have either tongue or pen,—against it till converted, and then for it, shall my powers be ever employed, alike indifferent to who are my friends or who are my opposers—what I shall gain or what I may lose. But the *men* of that faith will ever be treated respectfully by me,—I will never attack them in the back, nor betray the confidence which they may repose in me. JOHN REYNOLDS.

Newark, Dec. 23d, 1834.

We give place to the foregoing, notwithstanding its peculiar character well nigh if not quite destroys its claim to an insertion, because we would much rather give an individual, thus circumstanced, an extra latitude in our columns, than to knowingly deprive him of one iota of his actual rights.

We feel bound, however, at the very commencement, to apologize to all concerned, for one act of ours; and if there is any blame in the case, to assume it wholly to ourselves.—We allude to the suppression of a part of Br. Thomas' note. On greater reflection, we are satisfied we should have published *the whole*, in justice to Br. T. and we therefore now feel called upon to give his Note *entire, as he wrote it*, promising, that we were only actuated by a feeling of forbearance towards Mr. Reynolds, in withholding that part of it which presents, (as we regarded it,) such a papable evidence of duplicity. If he had honestly changed sentiments he had only frankly to acknowledge his belief in the doctrine of endless misery, and the subject would have been settled at once, for we have no interest in hunting him down. If he changes his views *twenty*, or even *forty* times a day, it is nothing to us, farther than circumstances may render it necessary for us to notice him. The present instance may be cited as one. With the circumstances in view before us we could not countenance his conduct, and more especially could not presume to send out his arguments to our readers as those of an actual believer in endless misery. Such a course we deemed unjust towards them as well as Limitarians. And the reader will form his own conclusions whether we misjudged or not.

The following is Br. Thomas' Note as originally forwarded us:—

JOHN REYNOLDS.

It is known that a public discussion of the question, *Is the doctrine of Universal Salvation taught in the Sacred Scriptures?* was recently holden in Newark, N. J. between Br. I. D. Williamson and the gentleman whose name appears at the head of this article. Mr. R. maintaining the *negative*. There is something mysterious in this matter. I do not know how to understand it. As I dislike dissimulation, I think proper to state the following facts:

In April, 1833, Mr. Reynolds called on me in Philadelphia; informed me that he was a believer in Universal Restoration; showed me the papers establishing his character; and desired my influence in procuring him a location in this region as a preacher of Universalism. I accompanied him to the residence of Br. L. F. W. Andrews, (who was at that time Pastor of the Callowhill-st. Church,) and Mr. Reynolds proceeded to give us his views, and to present the ground work of his faith. He totally discarded the doctrine of endless punishment; considered it an absurd and God-dishonoring sentiment; and expressed a desire to be engaged in proclaiming the final salvation of all men. Br. Andrews and myself were pleased with this interview, and felt disposed to do what we could to procure a location for Mr. R. He left us, promising to call on me the next day. He did not come A few days subsequently, I received a letter from him, dated "Newark, May 2, 1833," in which he apologizes for his seeming neglect. The letter contains the following paragraph:

"I shall remain in *statu quo*, with a revolving eye after some opening to greater usefulness in a field, the scenery of which has long charmed my soul. In the interim, I shall be pleased to keep up with you a *confidential* intercourse, and doubt not that all that has already passed will remain in *sacred confidence* with you and your esteemed colleague."

I hope that the circumstances of the case will be considered a sufficient apology for the publication of the foregoing extract. I think I do nothing but sheer justice to community in exposing duplicity. If Mr. R. can present a satisfactory explanation of his conduct, I shall be very glad to receive it. If he cannot, his Protestant Methodist friends

will know exactly what confidence they may safely repose in him. A. C. T.

A few particulars in Mr. Reynolds' article we should perhaps notice.

He appeals to the reader whether a private explanation would not have better comported with a "confidential intercourse" and "strong pretensions to brotherly love."—May we ask who made this confidential? And then, with what kind of confidence, pray tell, could we have called for a *private* explanation of a person standing before us as did Mr. R.? If he could pursue a course of dissimulation with his Methodist friends, we had no reason to count with any certainty upon a different course with us. A man that renders himself obnoxious to suspicions, must expect to be regarded with distrust. Besides, we really know of no obligations of "confidential intercourse" or principles of "brotherly love" that call for a compromise with a course of dissimulation!

He speaks of our "unfriendly insinuations." We certainly indulged no "unfriendly" feelings. We spoke frankly and explicitly, as we desired him to do. We had formerly heard of his friendship for Universalism, but after circumstances inclined us to another opinion. Then again the receipt of Br. T.'s note and other circumstances led us to distrust him altogether, and to suppose he was still "in *statu quo*, with a *revolving* eye to some"—*personal distinction!* and that it was of but little consequence from *which side* that distinction should come. His reply has not changed our opinion in his favor. The very mysticism in which he has attempted to wrap his creed is evidence that he is still in his favorite "*statu quo*."

If his objections are *real*, so much the better, for thus far he can at least lay claim to *frankness*,—all that we desired. The simple fact of their being *real*, instead of *supposed* objections, does not necessarily increase their force, for we humbly conceive that an understanding Universalist might *suppose* as strong difficulties against the sentiment as any actual objector could bring.

His "note of defiance" is labor lost, for we are otherwise too actively engaged, even if we made any pretensions to skill in the controversial field, which we do not. And beside, we conceive he is already in the hand of one who is abundantly able to attend to him.

We esteem it folly for Mr. R. to attempt to work up a sympathy by alledging that he is "between two fires."—What could he expect otherwise? "No man can serve two masters." A frank and honorable course never "burnt" any man's fingers yet. And in such a course, it would seem to us impossible that a man could lose the entire confidence of *two* such opposite parties as the Universalist and Limitarian, and on the same subject, too!

We see not what possible connexion the question of future or no future punishment, has with this business. Good men will not wish him punishment, unless he is deserving of it; and even then, no more than is just and proper, whether it is now, or hereafter. *We*, however, should not much like the *immediate* consequences of dissembling. He need apprehend little from an "argus-eyed examination," unless his extreme retiring modesty impels him into another public discussion, for notoriety, or some other object, with those whose favor he is *secretly* endeavoring to secure, his "*regrets*" at receiving so "much notice" to the contrary notwithstanding.

We care not how much his "giant powers" are exerted against the "abstract question of Universalism." If the "*men*" of that faith are respected by him, he will no more come to them with a "smiling face" and "honied words," while selfishness alone is at the bottom, than he will "attack them in the back," or "betray confidence."

But we have perhaps already devoted too much space to this subject, especially as we would not like to *increase* his "*regrets*" that "so small an object should receive so much attention." We shall honestly regret it, if we have drawn one *unjust* conclusion from Mr. R.'s conduct, as it has been presented to us, but we cannot help the convictions of our own mind. If he satisfies others, so far so good. P.

To Mr. Ezra Stiles Ely.—Letter 12.

Philadelphia, Jan. 3d, 1835.

Dear Sir—The perusal of your exposition of Luke xvi, 19—31 has afforded me not a little pleasure. Heretofore you have frequently simply cited a passage of Scripture, depending on the prepossessions of our readers for the acknowledgment of its relevancy to the point in debate; but in reference to the account of the rich man and Lazarus, you have, in the main, pursued a different (and I will add, a commendable) course. You have attempted to show that said account is properly considered descriptive of the condition of men in a future state; and in endeavoring to establish this position, you have taken a tolerably comprehensive survey of the whole subject. This is right. It is precisely what I have repeatedly desired you to do with many passages by you introduced into this discussion; and I hope that you will continue practically to acknowledge the propriety of the course adverted to.

The conclusions to which you have arrived bear the semblance of just deduction. It is generally true, that "he who is first in his own cause seemeth just;" yet it is equally true, that when "his neighbor cometh after and searcheth him," a different aspect may be given to the whole matter. In attending to this subject, I shall have occasion to search many of your statements, with special reference to the general issue; and also to bring to light a number of important considerations which you have entirely overlooked.

First of all, I will mention a few particulars, which I desire you to consider as so many preliminary objections to your exposition.

1st. You cite the testimony of Solomon, that when a man dies, "the dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." *This is pure Universalism.* Allow me to inquire whether the spirit of the rich man *returned unto God* who gave it, when it was *sent into an endless hell*?

2d. In your letter of May 15, 1834, you distinctly state that *hades*, hell, is to be destroyed. You affirm, indeed, that in hades there is a Paradise and a Gehenna of fire; but it matters not how many apartments you may suppose it to contain—for hades is to be destroyed, however numerous its divisions may be. This you allow—and yet, as if purposely to contradict yourself, you contend for the doctrine of endless punishment, on the ground that the rich man is represented as being in hades! Can you conceive of endless punishment in a place that is to be destroyed?

3d. Your whole exposition is predicated of the supposition, that the subject matter before us is "Christ's statement of some events of which he had a perfect knowledge." You consider it a history, an account of literal facts. Yet you have interpreted much of the language in a parabolic sense! You consider *Abraham's bosom* an *emblem*—and in so considering it you have abandoned the entire ground-work of your argument—for if Abraham's bosom be a figure, or parabolic representation of something else, the same may be said of Lazarus, and also of the rich man. If by Abraham's bosom be not signified the literal bosom of that patriarch, you have no right to assume that either Lazarus or the rich man was a real personage. If *one* part of the account be literal, such also must be the character of the *entire relation*. If *one* part be emblematical, the *whole* must be interpreted parabolically. Yet you have assigned to the several portions just such character, symbolical or literal, as you thought would best comport with your general views of the subject. I cannot allow you this priviledge.—If either Lazarus or the rich man was a real personage, who died a literal death, then Abraham's bosom was the literal bosom of that patriarch; and the rich man was tormented in literal flames of fire; and literal water was called for; and there was a literal gulf—and so on to the end of the chapter. You assume that the torments of the rich man were *symbolized* "by comparing them to pains produced by intense and unquenchable fires." And if this part of the account be symbolical, the whole relation must be interpreted parabolically.

4th. Your exposition of the subject required you to make many unauthorized assumptions. I shall say nothing of the assumptions that Lazarus was "a true christian," and that the rich man was "a mere worldling," "an ungodly man." I find no such intimations in the record. But I pass to notice, 1st. You assume that *Lazarus was buried*. The text does not say so. You indeed found it necessary to assume this point, in order to make out your case—but I shall presently show that the truth of the matter does not require, but rather forbids, the assumption in question. We are simply certified, that "the beggar died, and was carried into Abraham's bosom." 2d. You assume that the subject refers to the *spirits* or *souls* of the two characters mentioned. Nothing of the kind is intimated in any part of the account. I grant that such assumption is an essential item of your exposition—but I desire to receive the record as it stands, being satisfied that we need not either take from, or add to, the testimony, in order to arrive at its true signification.

Your attention is now solicited to a few considerations, which shall presently be more particularly noticed. 1st. Why was *Abraham's* bosom especially mentioned, if so be that the society of the blessed hereafter is signified by that expression? Why not the bosom of Elijah, or Enoch, or Isaac, or Jacob? In *my* view of the subject, this question is satisfactorily answered, as I think my correspondent will yet acknowledge. 2d. Why does the rich man give the endearing appellation of *Father* to Abraham? and why does the latter acknowledge the affinity by addressing the former as his *Son*? It is worthy of notice, that the rich man calls on no one but *Abraham*, and that he does not speak of Lazarus as his *brother*. I shall account for these facts presently. 3d. Abraham is represented as directing the five brethren to consult *Moses and the prophets*. Does not this fact incontrovertibly prove that none but the tribes of Israel had part in the matter? I mention these points as preliminary inquiries. They will lead our minds into profitable investigation.

We must now attend to the consideration of the general character of the subject. Is it "Christ's statement of some events of which he had perfect knowledge"? that is, is it a relation of literal facts? or is it a parable? If it be the former, you must so interpret it in all its parts, and I must yield the argument, so far as future punishment is concerned. If however, it be a parable, Lazarus was not a real personage, but simply the parabolic representative of some nation or people, of whom his condition was a striking figure. The same must also be true of the rich man.—Carrying out the parabolic interpretation, we shall discover that their deaths respectively, and hades, and the flame, and the gulf, and Abraham's bosom, are not to be understood literally, but only to be viewed as figures of things which they symbolically represented.

You say, "this *account* is not called a *parable*." True—neither is the account of the prodigal Son called a parable—nor are we informed that Jesus spake parabolically when he uttered the language concerning the lost piece of silver—nor did Jotham inform the people that he spake a parable when he told of the time when the trees went forth to anoint a king over them, Judges ix—and though, in introducing the account of the hundred sheep, the *historian* says, "And he spake this parable unto them," yet we are not certified that *Jesus* called it a parable. In introducing the account of the Pharisee and publican, the historian says, "He spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others," but we are not authorized to affirm that *Jesus* called it a parable. He began by saying, "Two men went up into the Temple to pray."—Indeed, so common a thing was it for our Lord to communicate instruction in parables, that it is written, "Without a parable spake he not unto them, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables," Matt. xiii, 34, 35.

That the subject before us is a parable, and not a history, is contended by Lightfoot, Whitby, and Hammond—than whom never lived stronger advocates of endless punishment. But the simple fact that to interpret the whole account literally, or as a history, would involve contradictory and absurd results, argues conclusively that it is a parable. I repeat, that I cannot allow you to assign to this part a historical, and to that a symbolical meaning. It must either be wholly literal, or wholly figurative. It cannot be partly one, and partly the other.

I agree with you that "a parable is but an extended similitude, or illustration, designed not to introduce fancies, but to exhibit and enforce truth." And the question now to be answered, is, what truth did Jesus intend to exhibit and enforce in the parable before us? I reply—he intended to illustrate the truth, that if the Scribes and Pharisees would not accredit the testimony of the miracles by him wrought in attestation of the divinity of his mission, "neither would they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

I will now state, that I consider the rich man the parabolic representative of the unbelieving Jewish people, especially of the Scribes and Pharisees; that Lazarus is the parabolic representative of the publicans and sinners, whether of Jewish or Gentile extraction; that by Abraham's bosom is symbolized the Gospel Kingdom; and that hades is symbolically used, as in other parts of the Bible, to represent the miseries and torments experienced by those of whom the rich man is the parabolic representative.

You now have the outline of what I consider the only true exposition of the subject; and I desire you to observe, that I shall not give a figurative interpretation to one part, and a literal signification to another. Viewing it as a parable, as such it shall be wholly explained.

I consider the death spoken of as being solely and alone a *national death*. I beg you to suspend judgment on this statement, until you bring to remembrance that the prodigal son is stated to have been DEAD, even while he lived in the flesh. "This my son *was* DEAD, *and* IS ALIVE *again*."—And I think I shall be enabled to show, that said prodigal son, and the lost sheep, and the lost piece of silver, and Lazarus, equally stand as the parabolic representatives of the publicans and sinners, whether of Jewish or Gentile extraction.

In the beginning of Luke xv it is written, "Then drew near unto him *all the publicans and sinners* for to hear him. And *the Pharisees and Scribes* murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." Then commences our Lord's discourse FROM THIS TEXT; and said discourse, comprising a series of pointed parables, is continued to the close of chap. xvi. Publicans and sinners, on the one hand, and the Pharisees and Scribes, on the other, composed his audience.

In the parables of the lost sheep and the lost piece of silver, our Saviour sets forth the unjustifiable character of Pharisaic murmuring. He gives the murmurers to understand, that as the shepherd and the woman respectively rejoiced when they had recovered the things severally lost, so every one should rejoice that Messias came to save sinners, to seek and to save that which was lost. In the parable which follows, the same general instruction is conveyed. The elder brother is the representative of the Scribes and Pharisees—the prodigal son of the returning publicans and sinners. The character of the former is inimitably represented by the elder brother. He murmured because the prodigal was received into favor—"he was angry, and would not go in."—I cannot avoid remarking incidentally, that he who says, "if all men are to go to heaven, *I* do not wish to go there," may behold his image in the spirit of the elder brother.

The parable with which chap. xvi commences, was addressed to the disciples, the same audience being present. Therein the Scribes and Pharisees, (who sat in Moses' seat,) are represented by the unjust steward. To them had been committed the oracles of God, and they were the administrators of the law covenant. They were unfaithful to their trust, and were therefore to be discharged. At verse 14, it is written, "And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things; and they derided him."—They felt the power and application of the parable. Our Saviour then proceeded to show them, that as they had been married to the law, they were bound to be faithful thereunto. "Moses in the law and the prophets did write" of Jesus of Nazareth; and now that he was come, they were under obligations to receive him as the Messiah.—Continuing to dilate on the subject matter before him, our Lord introduced the parable of the rich man and Lazarus; and in this parable he kept his eye on the truth he designed to enforce, namely, that if the Scribes and Pharisees still disbelieved the divinity of his mission, "neither would they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." A *real* Lazarus had been raised—Jesus himself subsequently rose—and the truth he designed to enforce in the parable was fully verified.

In Isaiah i, 6 the people of Israel are figuratively represented as being full of "wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores." In the same sense, the Scribes and Pharisees considered the publicans and sinners as being covered with the sores of sin. For this reason they murmured that Jesus should receive sinners, and eat with them. Those publicans and sinners figuratively laid at the gate of the Temple, and desired to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich steward's table. The woman of Canaan who besought our Saviour to heal her daughter, was told that it was "not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs." Her answer was, "Truth, Lord; yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table." Matt. xv, 26, 27. I refer to this example for the purpose of showing that the figurative use I have made of the fact, that the publicans and sinners desired to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the table of the Scribes and Pharisees, is altogether admissible.

Our master, in the parable of the man who commanded his two sons to go into the vineyard to labor, said to the Scribes and Pharisees, "The publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believe him not; but the publicans and harlots believed him; and ye when ye saw it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him," Matt. xxi, 31, 22. When the publicans and sinners believed in Christ, they died a *national death*—that is, they were no longer either Jews or Gentiles, but Christians. They died a *national death*, BUT THEY WERE NOT BURIED—they "were translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son," Col. i, 13, where "there is neither Jew nor Greek," *as such*; "for ye are all one in Christ Jesus," Gal. iii, 28. And said *translation* into the kingdom of God's dear Son, is signified by the expression, "carried into Abraham's bosom;" for the Apostle adds, "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye *Abraham's seed*." It is also written, "They which be of *faith*, ARE *blessed* WITH *faithful Abraham*." Gal. iii, 9. The publicans and sinners, *in their life time as Jews or Gentiles*, received "evil things." But when they died the national death before mentioned, they entered into *the spiritual life of the Gospel*; and in the kingdom of God's dear Son, they were comforted by the faith of Abraham. Were I to imitate your example, I should say, that "every *candid* reader would naturally come to the same conclusions," in reference to this subject. But I will not make so sweeping a declaration. I will only say, that *I do not perceive* how any one who carefully examines the matter, can come to a *different* conclusion.

I stated that, in my judgment, the rich man was the parabolic representative of the unbelieving Jewish people, specially of the Scribes and Pharisees. They "shut up the kingdom of heaven against men." They neither went in themselves, nor suffered those who were entering to go in. In shutting up the Gospel kingdom, they shut themselves out. And what was the consequence? They entered not into the faith of Abraham, and of course were not partakers of its joys. But more than this. When they had filled up the measure of their iniquities by crucifying the Lord of life and glory, decay seized on the vitals of their civil polity; and in the final overthrow and destruction of their city and temple, and consequently the abrogation of the law covenant, *they died a national death*. Before Jerusalem was hemmed in on every side, they who had been translated into the kingdom of God's dear son, saw the black thunder cloud of judgment lowering over the devoted city—and they escaped to the mountains of Judea. The unbelieving Jewish people, of whom the rich man is the parabolic representative, not only died a national death, but they were buried.—They were dead and buried in the same figurative sense that the same people were dead and buried during their captivity in Babylon. The vision recorded in Ezekiel xxxvii, places the latter subject in its proper light.

Continuing the parabolic interpretation, I desire to say, that the Jews opened not their eyes to behold the utter hopelessness of their case, until their city was surrounded and beseiged by the Roman army under Titus. Our Savior had foreseen and foretold this difficulty. He wept over the city, and said, "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace; but now *they are hid from thine eyes*. [The Scribes and Pharisees lifted up their eyes afterwards, and saw those things—but it was too late—they were in torment.] For the days shall come upon thee that thine enemies shall *cast a trench about thee*, and compass thee round, *and keep thee in on every side*; and shall lay thee even with the ground, and *thy children within thee*." Luke xix, 41—44 These obstacles, interposed between the believing Christians and the unbelieving Jewish people, in the destruction of the city and temple, are cymbolized by *the great gulf*. Hence Abraham is represented as saying, "they which would pass from hence to you *cannot*; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence." Such was strictly the fact at the period of the seige and overthrow of Jerusalem; and a symbolical gulf still interposes between Christians and Jews. The latter have ever been a distinct people; and whoever will consider their present condition, will perceive the existence of a gulf of separation between the Christian community and the house of Israel.

They of whom the rich man is the parabolic representative died a national death, and *were buried in hell*. Dr. Adam Clarke certifies us that, in his old MS. Bible, the passage reads thus: "Forsothe the riche man is dead; and is buried in helle." This reading is supported by several versions—and I verily believe it expresses the true signification of the text. The unbelieving Jewish nation were buried bodily in the hell to which their city and temple were thrust down: the same hell mentioned in Luke x, 15. "And thou Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be thrust down to *hell*, hades—that is from a state of prosperity and opulence, that city was to be thrust down to degradation and wo. In the very same hell the Jewish people "lifted up their eyes, being in torments." It was a hell of fire, in the Scriptural figurative sense of that expression. The Lord declared by the mouth of a prophet that he would make Jerusalem as Tophet, Jer. xix; and Isaiah says, "Tophet is ordained of old . . . the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone doth kindle it." Isa. xxx, 33. Where that fire was to be kindled, we learn from Isa. xxxi, 9. "And he shall pass over to his strong hold for fear, and his princes shall be afraid of the ensign, saith the Lord, *whose fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem*." This furnace of fire is mentioned in Matt. xiii, 42-50—in which passages the reference is the same as in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. See also Ezek. xxii, 19—22: "I will gather you *into the midst of Jerusalem* . . . . . and blow upon you *in the fire of my wrath*, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof." *In Jerusalem*, therefore, the flame of fire was kindled in which they, of whom the rich man is the parabolic representative, were to be tormented.

The fact that the rich man is represented as calling upon "*Father Abraham*," argues conclusively that *the Jews* were the persons so tormented. Nothing was, or is, more characteristic of a Jew, than the pride with which he speaks of Abraham as the progenitor of the Jewish nation. "*We have Abraham to our father*," was an expression in common use among that people. See Matt. iii, 9. John viii, 39. In the parable before us, Abraham is represented as acknowledging the relationship, in calling the rich man, "*Son*"—for the Jews were the lineal descendants of that patriarch, according to the flesh. I desire you to notice also, that Abraham speaks of "Moses and the prophets" as the testimonies to which the five brethren should attend. The Christians on the one hand, and the house of Israel on the other, are the only people who ever accredited those writings. Our Saviour, on a certain occasion, said to the Scribes and Pharisees, "Do not think that I will accuse you, to the Father: there is one that accuseth you,—even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me—for he wrote of me." John v, 45-47. How remarkably this answers to the closing part of the parable before us! "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. . . . . If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

This language certainly implies that Moses and the prophets had spoken of the torment which the rich man is experiencing. But I ask you to cite a single passage from either Moses or the prophets, in which there is any intimation of future endless punishment. Dr. Geo. Campbell says, "It is plain, that in the Old Testament *the most profound silence* is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys or sorrows, their happiness or misery." 6th Prelim. Diss. P. ii. §19. Dr. Jahn confirms this statement—for he says, "We have not authority decidedly to say, that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue the good and avoid the evil, than those which were derived from *the rewards and punishments of this life*." Archeology, §314. In view of your exposition of the parable before us, I ask, how could the five brethren of the rich man learn any thing from Moses and the prophets in relation to a place of endless torment, concerning which Moses and the prophets observe the most profound silence?

But Moses and the prophets both speak plainly of the torment to be endured by those of whom the rich man is the parabolic representative. I have already cited several passages on this subject from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; and I will now direct your attention to the language of Moses in Deut. xxxii: "For a *fire* is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, (*Sheol*, Heb.; *Hades*, Gr.,) and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischiefs upon them; I will spend mine arrows upon them. They shall be *burnt with hunger*, and *devoured with burning heat*, and with bitter destruction." This is figurative language—and such were the symbolical torments set forth in the parable; and Abraham is therefore properly represented as saying, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them."

David was a prophet. He says, Psalm lxxxvi, 13:—"Great is thy mercy toward me, and thou *hast* delivered my soul from the *lowest hell*," Sheol, Hades. He explains his meaning in Psalm cxvi, 3: "The sorrows of *death* compassed me, and *the pains of hell gat hold on me*: I found trouble and sorrow." Such was the hell in which the Jewish nation "lifted up their eyes, being in torments." It was in Jerusalem. There the fire of the Lord was kindled; and there they were "*burnt with hunger*, and *devoured with burning heat*, and with bitter destruction."

No reason can be assigned why the kingdom of heaven was likened unto *ten* virgins—nor why *one hundred* sheep is the number mentioned in the parable—nor why the woman is represented as having *ten* pieces of silver. So neither can a perfectly satisfactory reason be assigned why *five* is mentioned as the number of the rich man's brethren. In interpreting parables the *moral* is more to be regarded than the *details* of the story.

I have thus given an extended exposition of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. With "perverting scripture by scripture" I have nothing to do. I have humbly endeavored to compare spiritual things with spiritual, and thus allow *the man of my counsel*, the Bible, to be the interpreter of its own meaning. If I am in error, there is no one more competent than my respected correspondent to show me wherein I have erred, and to set me right. I can assure him, that however "bold and active" I may be in disseminating the knowledge of Immanuel's love, I do no more than my duty. I am sensible that were I to become the advocate of a limited salvation, I should be honored of men, and avoid multiform reproaches which I have already suffered, and must continue to suffer. "But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." Affectionately Yours.

AREL C. THOMAS.

CARRIERS ADDRESS

To the Patrons of the

MESSENGER AND UNIVERSALIST.

January 1, 1835.

BY A. C. THOMAS.

PATRONS AND FRIENDS:—The car of Time
Has brought us to another year;
And I propose, in humble rhyme,
To be the humbler chronicler
Of some few things which happen'd in
The twelve-month now forever o'er:
And should perchance my thoughts incline
To moralize, I must implore
Your wonted patience, to excuse
The rambling of a rambling muse.
And should I leave "the faded year,"
And for a while assume the seer,
(In other words, attempt to look
Into the sealed, eventful book,
Of eighteen hundred thirty-five,)
I hope your goodness will contrive
The useless toil to overlook.

"*The things behind—the things before*:"—
Thus spake a holy man of yore.
(And here the curious are referred
To verse thirteenth, Phillippians third.)
In those *two points*, I humbly deem,
Each person may behold a theme,
With interest and importance fraught,
Presenting ample scope for thought.
The *first* refers to *things now past*—
To *things to come* pertains the *last*.

And, first in order, come to mind,
The things now past, "*the things behind*."

Another year! another year!—
How rapid is the flight of Time!
Yet in his onward swift career,
Thousands in ev'ry age and clime,
With careless eye have viewed his glass,
And seen the wasting moments pass,
Without reflecting that no pow'r
Can e'er bring back an ill spent hour;
That grief nor sorrow can remand
Into Time's glass a single sand!

And, peradventure even thus,
The wane of years has been with *us*.

"The things behind!" Let memory cast
A glance upon the twelve-month past
And let the scenes of good and ill
The retrospective vision fill;—
Yea, let remembrance bring to view
The lights and shades, the smiles and tears,
With which the year thus journey'd thro',
So much diversified appears.
The panoramic sight reveals
Forgotten joys,—the vista opes
On many wounds which time but heals,
Or brings before us blighted hopes,
And buried loves, and prospects crushed,
Ere in the opening bud they blushed!

A wide survey let memory take,
And scan the scenes of "days of old;"
Her magic touch the bars may break,
And burst the gates of death's strong hold.
The grave, obedient to her pow'r,
May open, and give back the dead!
And friends, long mouldered, stand before
Our presence as they stood of yore,
When social joy and converse shed
O'er kindred hearts, a kindred glow
Of bliss, which none but friends can know.

But when thus viewing bliss enjoyed,
Mem'ry recalls succeeding wo,
She weeps a sad, an aching void—
Wife, children, friends, in death laid low!

Thrice happy he who thus the book
Of by-gone days can freely scan,
And then to God sincerely look,
And vindicate his ways to man.

Leaving these topics for the mind
Of each, in hope, to dwell upon,
I pass, a different theme to find,
Among the days now past and gone.

In speaking of "the things behind,"
We must not fail to bring to mind,
That eighteen hundred thirty-four
Gave rise to controversies, more
Than had been known for years before.
The time would fail to mention all
That we to mem'ry might recall:
So, if you please, we'll but recur
To those that in the "*Messenger*,"
During the year now journey'd thro',
From time to time were brought to view.

Our friends, y'clept the "Dutch Reformed,"
Wax'd warm for fight, as well you know;
Awile they raved, and stamp'd and storm'd,
And said, that when their blood was warm'd,
We might expect *a mighty blow*.
We trembled not, nor stood aghast.—
The blow long threatened came at last.
It *was* a blow—a *blow of breath!*
It spake of *smiting*, and of death!
It spake of SIFTING *—yea, declared
That worse than Peter would have fared,
Had Satan "got him on the hip,"
We *heretics* would fare, when they
On *us* and on our faith should lay
A "Dutch Reformer's" grip!
A sieve then in their hands they took,
By College-craft bestowed;
Into the sieve they put a book,(†)
And then the sieve they strongly shook,
And vehemently *blowed!*
T * * * * s looked on, but nought could see
Even so it was with "DOCTOR P."—(‡)
But S * * * * R thought that in the gust
Of wind, *he* saw *a little dust!*

When the great blow was fairly o'er,
Those valiant men of Gath
Became as quiet, as before
The threatening of wrath,
And though the *true Damascus blade*, (‖)
Which erst in fury they displayed,
Into the scabbard is not thrust,
The *book* by them so much decried,
And eke the *sieve*, are laid aside,
To moulder and to must.

The "fight of faith," in which engaged
Ely and *Thomas* long have been,
In courteous spirit has been waged,
As you undoubtedly have seen.

Some incidental thoughts occur,
With which your judgment will concur—
That if opponents thus would use
Each other kindly, and respect
Each other's *rights*, if not their *views*,
Much greater good they would effect,
Than any mortal need expect
To flow from rancor and abuse.

The correspondence you've perused,
As we the letters brought to light;
And *'tis* not, *should* not be supposed,
That all in judgement can unite.
But here a plain and simple fact,
I humbly beg to introduce,
On which unbiassed minds will act,
And just and true results deduce.

Seven editors who advocate
Our glorious doctrine, circulate
Each *Letter* of the whole debate,
To make it widely known;
While those who teach a different creed,
Have given not the slightest heed
To what is going on!
And many folks have marvelled much
That Limitarians have not brought
The Letters into view,—the which—
(If soberly they thought
That the Evangelist was whipt,
Or that the Doctor was equipt
With argument to put him down,)
They would most certainly have done.

Our faithful brother, Shaler J.,
(A good Evangelist and true,)
Who, as you know, long fought his way,
Through ranks of foes, a stern array,
The Gospel banner to display,
To men in regions new,—
Held a debate some twelve months since,
With a very clever man;
And though he did not quite convince
The latter of the Gospel plan,
He made opposing brethren wince,
(As mightily he can,)
Beneath the power of truth divine,
In speaking of the wise design
Of God, in all his works display'd,
And in his word still brighter made.
The issue of the whole affair,
Beyond the shadow of a doubt,
Evinces who the crown may wear:—
Hillyer stood up—but Payne *backed out!*

Last March, the noted Patterson
A sermon preached, in which he took
Positions which, he should have known,
Were not established by "the Book,"—
(A *common* practice, I may add,
With those who make the righteous sad,) (§)
A witness of *the truth* was there,
Who subsequently brought to view,
In letter form, the whole affair,
And we presented it to you, (¶)
That letter, as you doubtless know,
In frankness was designed to show,
That he to whom it was addressed,
Against the Bible had transgressed,
In taking from, and adding to,
The record which is just and true.
It also properly inquired,
Upon what principles the doom
Of endless death can be required,
In the undying state to come.

The mighty man of war replied,
"*I'm busy, and can not come down!*
On looking up, our witness spied
This champion of renown,
Standing most valiantly upon
The gloomy walls of *Babylon!* (**)
And he *was* busy,—for he wrought
As strongly as he could,
To save from falling into nought
The walls on which he stood.
And up he piled stone after stone,
But down again they soon were thrown;
And then, with all his might and main,
He strove to pile them up again.
Hence said this workman of renown,
"*I'm busy and can not come down!*"

This speech our faithful witness heard,
And straight a sling and stone prepared.
With Gospel aim the stone he threw,
And to the mark it swiftly flew;
And he who would not condescend
His heathen notions to defend,
With arguments from *Holy Writ*,
By the smooth stone was fairly hit,
Where he of Gath was smote of yore,
And you and I beheld him fall,
Backward behind the heathen wall,
On which he stood before.

Yet fully we believe that he,
When Babylon destroyed shall be,
From thence to Zion's heavenly hill,
Redeemed from sin and heathen thrall,
Shall meekly come and bow his will,
To Jesus as the "Lord of all."

Hasten, O Lord, the glorious day,
When *all* obedient to thy sway,
Shall mount and soar to realms above,
To feel the joys of deathless love,
The quick'ning of the mystic Dove!

Here I must pause—tho' still I might
Full many such like things suggest,
Pertaining to the bloodless fight,
De Vinne, Cushman, and the rest,
Have waged against our righteous cause—
But here my rambling muse must pause.

Thus far the *past*, "*the things behind*."—
What shall I say of *things to come?*
Imagination here may find
A boundless field in which to roam.
"THE THINGS BEFORE!" Life, death is there,
And an eternity beyond!—
Fancy is cautioned to beware,
But Christian *Faith* must not despond.
Tis true, the future is a book,
Sealed up by him who cannot err;
And though in *it* we may not look,
Full many things we may infer
From the experience of the past—
And this the *mem'ry* must supply;
While in *the Bible* if we cast
A candid and enquiring eye,
"The things before," our minds may scan,
Touching the destiny of man.

First, then, we briefly may recur,
To what from mem'ry we infer.

All that we we've felt, and all we know,
Must pointedly and plainly show,
That peace and permanent delight,
Are consequent of doing right;
And that unuttered grief and wo,
From doing wrong must ever flow.

We must expect to meet with some
Reverses in the days to come;
Some clouds of darkness will arise;
Some tears of grief will fill our eyes;
The Lord, who ruleth over all,
May think it best on us to call
To hear some friend's departing breath,
And seal his rayless eyes in death!

But let not this our peace destroy,—
We also shall much *bliss* enjoy;
Much happiness we all shall feel,
As Time rolls round his viewless wheel;
And doubtless every one will see,
That "as his days, his strength shall be."

Such were among "the things behind"—
Why not among "the things before?"
In *thirty five* we such shall find,
For such we found in *thirty-four*.

And when we to *the Bible* turn,
And there the love of God discern—
His *universal, changeless* love,
Displayed below, reserved above—
We can most heartily confide
In *Him*, whose goodness will provide
All needed good, for all our race,
In every change of state or place.

"*The things behind—the things before!*"
The labour of my muse is o'er.

(*) The editors of the N. Y. "Christian Intelligencer," the approved organ of the Dutch Reformed Church, mightily threatened "to *sift* Universalism to the bottom."

(†) Edwards against Chauncey. It is believed that the Dutch Reformed editors never read a Universalist book, excepting the Bible.

(‡) The editors referred to, once designated the proprietor of the Messenger, as "Doctor P., the printer."

(‖) Dr. Brownlee speaks much of wielding "the New Jerusalem blade." It is confidently believed, however, that he commonly uses a sword which he obtained at Damascus. Saul of Tarsus, once set out to procure the same blade, (Acts ix, 1, 2,) but Jesus met him on the way, and converted him into a minister and a witness of the truth. It appears to us that Dr. B. entered Damascus without having seen the Saviour; and that he succeeded in obtaining the sword.

(§) Ezekiel xiii, 22.

(¶) Messenger and Universalist, Vol. iii, p. 161.

(**) Babylon was a heathen city—and "Mystery Babylon" is mentioned in the Apocalypse. That Mr. Patterson, when he said, "*I'm busy, and* CAN NOT *come down*," was standing on the walls of "Mystery Babylon," is evident from two considerations: 1st. His doctrine of endless punishment is "the mystery of iniquity;" and 2d. By a reference to his letter, (Messenger and Universalist, Vol. iii. p. 213.) it will be perceived that he endeavors to establish said doctrine by *heathen mythology*,—which makes it perfectly plain that he was standing on the *walls of Babylon*.